UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,654	06/28/2001	Manoel Tenorio	020431.0841	6772

53184   7590   11/14/2008
i2 TECHNOLOGIES US, INC.
ONE i2 PLACE, 11701 LUNA ROAD
DALLAS, TX 75234

EXAMINER
CHBOUKI, TAREK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2165	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/895,654	TENORIO, MANOEL
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TAREK CHBOUKI	2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 July 2008</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.** 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION
Response to Amendment

This Office action has been issued in response to amendment filed on 07/25/2008

Claims 1-28 are pending. Applicants' arguments have been carefully and respectfully considered, a new

ground of rejection is made. Accordingly, this action has been made FINAL necessitated by amendment.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's argument are moot in view the new ground of rejection.

With respect to Applicant's argument regarding the invalidity of 35 USC 101 made against claims 1, 9, 17

and 25-28. Examiner disagrees and maintains the rejection because as claimed the system is lacking a

definite hardware components hence directed to a software per se.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:
Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any
new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this
title.

1.   Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-

statutory subject matter.

        Claim 1 refers to a "electronic commerce system ". As cited on pages 6-8 of this instant

specification, has provided evidence that the claimed system is a software per se, wherein a series of

modules are to be executed. The claims do not define structural and functional descriptive material used

in interrelationship between the computer software and the hardware like a memory or processor.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When <u>functional</u> descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Claim 9 refers to a "method". As cited on pages 6-8 of this instant specification, has provided evidence that the claimed method is a software per se, wherein a series of modules are to be executed. The claims do not define structural and functional descriptive material used in interrelationship between the computer software and the hardware like a memory or processor.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When <u>functional</u> descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Claim 17 refers to a "software". As cited on pages 6-8 of this instant specification, has provided evidence that the claimed "software" is a software per se, wherein a series of modules are to be executed. The claims do not define structural and functional descriptive material used in interrelationship between the computer software and the hardware like a memory or processor.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive

material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When <u>functional</u> descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Claim 25 refers to a "system". As cited on pages 6-8 of this instant specification, has provided evidence that the claimed system is a software per se, wherein a series of modules are to be executed. The claims do not define structural and functional descriptive material used in interrelationship between the computer software and the hardware like a memory or processor.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When <u>functional</u> descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Claim 26 refers to a "schema translation tool". As cited on pages 6-8 of this instant specification, has provided evidence that the claimed "schema translation tool" is a software per se, wherein a series of modules are to be executed. The claims do not define structural and functional descriptive material used in interrelationship between the computer software and the hardware like a memory or processor.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When <u>functional</u> descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and

will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to

be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Claim 27 refers to a "method". As cited on pages 6-8 of this instant specification, has provided

evidence that the claimed "method" is a software per se, wherein a series of modules are to be executed.

The claims do not define structural and functional descriptive material used in interrelationship between

the computer software and the hardware like a memory or processor.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional

descriptive material." Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive

material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When <u>functional</u> descriptive material is recorded on

some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and

will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to

be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Claim 28 refers to a "software for translating between schema". As cited on pages 6-8 of this

instant specification, has provided evidence that the claimed "software for translating between schema" is

a software per se, wherein a series of modules are to be executed. The claims do not define structural and

functional descriptive material used in interrelationship between the computer software and the hardware

like a memory or processor.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional

descriptive material." Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive

material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When <u>functional</u> descriptive material is recorded on

some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and

will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to

be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the
rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the
United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by
another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application
filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed
in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article
21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 1-2, 5-10, 13-18 and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Livesay, Jeffery et al (hereinafter Livesay) US Publication No 20080126265.

As per claim 1, Livesay discloses:

An electronic commerce system for translating between one or more schemas, the system

comprising:

a global content directory <u>server</u> (Abstract: lines 1-2 and FIG. 4, components 401 and 406)<u> **coupled to**</u>

<u>**one or more seller databases, the global content directory server** </u>**providing a plurality of buyers**

access to <u>the</u> one or more seller databases;

(Paragraphs [0088] and [0129], indicate global content directory (FIG. 4, components 401 and 406)

providing the buyer access to the seller database).

And a schema translation tool coupled to the global content (Paragraph [0100], wherein the XML

interface id the translation tool part of (coupled) to the matching system**), <u>directory server,</u>** (Abstract:

lines 1-2,**the schema translation tool comprising:**

a mapping module operable to:

receive information regarding a source schema and a target schema, the source and target schemas each comprising a taxonomy comprising a hierarchy of classes into which products may be categorized,

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema (XML data files) (buyer and seller) wherein the profile content grouping parameter is (taxonomy hierarchy of classes)).

wherein the target schema comprises a different taxonomy then the taxonomy of the source schema,

(Paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema having different profile content (taxonomy data)).

at least the source schema further comprising a product ontology associated with one or more of the classes, each product ontology comprising one or more product attributes;

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on profile content (product ontology) parameter (class))

and associate one or more source classes of the source schema with one or more target classes of the target schema;

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer based on a type of service parameter (class) to a seller proving the service or goods)

and an ontology generation module operable to generate a product ontology for each of the target classes based on the product ontologies of the associated source classes.

(FIG. 5 and pragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a "best fit" match (ontology association) of profile attributes(class))

As per claim 2, Livesay discloses:

The system of Claim 1, wherein the mapping module is further operable to:

receive input from at least one of the plurality of buyers indicating one or more source classes to be associated with one or more target classes;

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service (product ontology) parameter (class) using buyer profile (buyer input))

And associate the source classes with the target classes in response to the input from at least one of the plurality of buyers.

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service)

As per claim 5, Livesay discloses:

The system of Claim 1, wherein the ontology generation module is further operable to generate a product ontology for a target class by determining the intersection of the product attributes included in the product ontologies of the associated source classes.

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link based on "best fit" profile content (product ontology) is determining association between product parameters between seller and buyer).

As per claim 6, Livesay discloses:

The system of Claim 1, wherein the ontology generation module is further operable to generate a product ontology for a parent class of a plurality of target classes by determining the intersection of the product attributes included in the product ontologies of the target classes,

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining association between product parameters between seller and buyer).

the product ontologies of the target classes having been generated by the ontology generation module (FIG. 4 and FIG. 5).

As per claim 7, Livesay discloses:

The system of Claim 1, wherein:

at least the source schema further comprises a seller ontology associated with one or more of the classes, each seller ontology comprising one or more attributes associated with one or more sellers of a product;

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

And the ontology generation module is further operable to generate a seller ontology for each of the target classes based on the seller ontologies of the associated source classes.

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

As per claim 8, Livesay discloses:

The system of Claim 1, wherein:

one or more pointers identifying the one or more seller databases are associated with at least one source class,

(Paragraphs [0088] and [0129], indicate the database product identification linking the buyer and seller).

the one or more seller databases including product data associated with one or more products categorized in the source class;

(Paragraphs [0088] and [0129], indicate the database product identification linking the buyer and seller).

and the mapping module is further operable to associate the one or more pointers of the source class with one or more target classes associated with the source class.

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

As per claim 9, Livesay discloses:

A method for translating between one or more schemas, comprising:

receiving information regarding a source schema and a target schema,

the source and target schemas each comprising a taxonomy comprising a hierarchy of classes into which products may be categorized,

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema (XML data files) (buyer and seller) wherein the profile content grouping parameter is (taxonomy hierarchy of classes)).

wherein the target schema comprises a different taxonomy then the taxonomy of the source schema,

(Paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema having different profile content (taxonomy data)).

at least the source schema further comprising a product ontology associated with one or more of the classes, each product ontology comprising one or more product attributes;

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on profile content (product ontology) parameter (class))

associating one or more source classes of the source schema with one or more target classes of the target schema;

(FIG. 5, Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer based on a profile parameter (class) to a seller proving the service or goods)

and generating a product ontology for each of the target classes based on the product ontologies of the associated source classes.

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a "best fit" match (ontology association) of profile attributes(class))

As per claim 10, Livesay discloses:

The method of Claim 9, further comprising:

receiving input from at least one of a plurality of buyers indicating one or more source classes to be associated with one or more target classes;

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service (product ontology) parameter (class) using buyer profile (buyer input))

And associating the source classes with the target classes in response to the input from at least one of the plurality of buyers.

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service)

As per claim 13, Livesay discloses:

The method of Claim 9, further comprising generating a product ontology for a target class by determining the intersection of the product attributes included in the product ontologies of the associated source classes.

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link based on "best fit" profile content (product ontology) is determining association between product parameters between seller and buyer).

As per claim 14, Livesay discloses:

The method of Claim 9, further comprising generating a product ontology for a parent class of a plurality of target classes by determining the intersection of the product attributes included in the product ontologies of the target classes.

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link based on "best fit" profile content (product

ontology) is determining association between product parameters between seller and buyer).

As per claim 15, Livesay discloses:

The method of Claim 9, wherein:

at least the source schema further comprises a seller ontology associated with one or

more of the classes, each seller ontology comprising one or more attributes associated with one

or more sellers of a product;

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining

association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

and the method further comprises generating a seller ontology for each of the target classes

based on the seller ontologies of the associated source classes.

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining

association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

As per claim 16, Livesay discloses:

The method of Claim 9, wherein:

one or more pointers identifying one or more seller databases are associated with at least

one source class, the seller databases including product data associated with one or more

products categorized in the source class;

(Paragraphs [0088] and [0129], indicate the database product identification linking the buyer and seller).

and the method further comprises associating the pointers of the source class with one or

more target classes associated with the source class.

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining

association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

As per claim 17, Livesay discloses:

Software for translating between schemas, the software embodied in a computer-readable medium

and, when executed, operable to:

receive information regarding a source schema and a target schema, the source and target

schemas each comprising a taxonomy comprising a hierarchy of classes into which products may

be categorized,

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema (XML data files) (buyer and seller)

wherein the profile content grouping parameter is (taxonomy hierarchy of classes)).

wherein the target schema comprises a different taxonomy then the taxonomy of

the source schema,

(Paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema having different profile content (taxonomy data)).

at least the source schema further comprising a product ontology associated with one or more of

the classes, each product ontology comprising one or more product attributes;

 (FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on profile content

(product ontology) parameter (class))

associate one or more source classes of the source schema with one or more target classes

of the target schema;

(FIG. 5, Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer based on a profile parameter (class) to a

seller proving the service or goods)

and generate a product ontology for each of the target classes based on the product ontologies

of the associated source classes.

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a "best fit" match

(ontology association) of profile attributes(class))

As per claim 18, Livesay discloses:

The software of Claim 17, further operable to:

receive input from at least one of a plurality of buyers indicating one or more source

classes to be associated with one or more target classes;

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service (product

ontology) parameter (class) using buyer profile (buyer input))

and associate the source classes with the target classes in response to the input from at least

one of the plurality of buyers.

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service)

As per claim 21, Livesay discloses:

The software of Claim 17, further operable to generate a product

ontology for a target class by determining the intersection of the product attributes included in

the product ontologies of the associated source classes.

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link based on "best fit" profile content (product

ontology) is determining association between product parameters between seller and buyer).

As per claim 22, Livesay discloses:

The software of Claim 17, further operable to generate a product

ontology for a parent class of a plurality of target classes by determining the intersection of the

product attributes included in the product ontologies of the target classes.

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link based on "best fit" profile content (product

ontology) is determining association between product parameters between seller and buyer).

As per claim 23, Livesay discloses:

The software of Claim 17, wherein:

at least the source schema further comprises a seller ontology associated with one or

more of the classes, each seller ontology comprising one or more attributes associated with one

or more sellers of a product;

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining

association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

 and the software is further operable to generate a seller ontology for each of the target classes

based on the seller ontologies of the associated source classes.

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining

association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

As per claim 24, Livesay discloses:

The software of Claim 17, wherein:

one or more pointers identifying one or more seller databases are associated with at least

one source class, the seller databases including product data associated with one or more

products categorized in the source class;

(Paragraphs [0088] and [0129], indicate the database product identification linking the buyer and seller).

and the software is further operable to associate the pointers of the source class with one or

more target classes associated with the source class.

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining

association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

As per claim 25, Livesay discloses:

A system for translating between schemas, comprising:

means for receiving information regarding a source schema and a target schema, the

source and target schemas each comprising a taxonomy comprising a hierarchy of classes into

which products may be categorized,

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema (XML data files) (buyer and seller)

wherein the profile content grouping parameter is (taxonomy hierarchy of classes)).

wherein the target schema comprises a different taxonomy then the taxonomy of the source schema,

(Paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema having different profile content (taxonomy data)).

at least the source schema further comprising a product ontology associated with one or more of

the classes, each product ontology comprising one or more product attributes;

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on profile content

(product ontology) parameter (class))

means for associating one or more source classes of the source schema with one or more

target classes of the target schema;

(FIG. 5, Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer based on a profile parameter (class) to a

seller proving the service or goods)

and means for generating a product ontology for each of the target classes based on the

product ontologies of the associated source classes.

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a "best fit" match

(ontology association) of profile attributes(class))

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth

in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior

art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was

made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall

not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 3-4, 11-12, 19-20 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Livesay, Jeffery et al (hereinafter Livesay) US Publication No 20080126265 in view of Vedula,

Nagender et al (hereinafter Vedula) US Patent No. 6823495.

As per claim 3, Livesay discloses the parsing of data profile and the matching of desired service between

buyer and seller, but does not go into detail regarding generating a graphical representation of profile

content (taxonomy), however in an analogous art of data mapping, Vedula teaches:

The system of Claim 2, wherein the mapping module is further operable to:

generate a graphical representation of the taxonomies of the source and target schemas,

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented)

the graphical representation allowing at least one of the plurality of buyers to graphically associate classes of the source schema with classes of the target schema;

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented wherein the buyer is the user)

and communicate the graphical representation to at least one of the plurality of buyers.

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented wherein the buyer is the user)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Vedula and Livesay by incorporating the teaching of Vedula into the method of Livesay. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the graphical representation of buyer and seller schema mechanism of Vedula into the system of Livesay for the purpose of providing a graphical tree hieratical structure of target schemas.

As per claim 4, Livesay discloses the parsing of data profile and the matching of desired service between buyer and seller, but does not go into detail regarding generating a graphical representation of profile, however in an analogous art of data mapping, Vedula teaches:

The system of Claim 1, wherein the source classes are leaf classes of the source schema.

(FIG. 1, wherein field1 is leaf entry of source schema).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Vedula and Livesay by incorporating the teaching of Vedula into the method of Livesay. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the graphical

representation of buyer schema mechanism of Vedula into the system of Livesay for the purpose of

providing a graphical tree hieratical structure of target schemas.

As per claim 11, Livesay discloses the parsing of data profile and the matching of desired service between

buyer and seller, but does not go into detail regarding generating a graphical representation of profile

content (taxonomy), however in an analogous art of data mapping, Vedula teaches:

generating a graphical representation of the taxonomies of the source and target schemas,

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented)

the graphical representation allowing at least one of the plurality of buyers to graphically associate

classes of the source schema with classes of the target schema;

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented wherein the

buyer is the user)

and communicating the graphical representation to at least one of the plurality of buyers.

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented wherein the

buyer is the user)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine Vedula and Livesay by incorporating the teaching of Vedula into the method of

Livesay. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the graphical

representation of buyer and seller schema mechanism of Vedula into the system of Livesay for the

purpose of providing a graphical tree hieratical structure of target schemas.

As per claim 12, Livesay discloses the parsing of data profile and the matching of desired service between

buyer and seller, but does not go into detail regarding generating a graphical representation of profile,

however in an analogous art of data mapping, Vedula teaches:

The method of Claim 9, wherein the source classes are leaf classes of the source schema.

(FIG. 1, wherein field1 is leaf entry of source schema).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine Vedula and Livesay by incorporating the teaching of Vedula into the method of

Livesay. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the graphical

representation of buyer schema mechanism of Vedula into the system of Livesay for the purpose of

providing a graphical tree hieratical structure of target schemas.

As per claim 19, Livesay discloses the parsing of data profile and the matching of desired service between

buyer and seller, but does not go into detail regarding generating a graphical representation of profile

content (taxonomy), however in an analogous art of data mapping, Vedula teaches:

generating a graphical representation of the taxonomies of the source and target schemas,

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented)

the graphical representation allowing at least one of the plurality of buyers to graphically associate

classes of the source schema with classes of the target schema;

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented wherein the

buyer is the user)

and communicating the graphical representation to at least one of the plurality of buyers.

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented wherein the

buyer is the user)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine Vedula and Livesay by incorporating the teaching of Vedula into the method of

Livesay. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the graphical

representation of buyer and seller schema mechanism of Vedula into the system of Livesay for the

purpose of providing a graphical tree hieratical structure of target schemas.

As per claim 20, Livesay discloses the parsing of data profile and the matching of desired service between

buyer and seller, but does not go into detail regarding generating a graphical representation of profile,

however in an analogous art of data mapping, Vedula teaches:

The software of Claim 17, wherein the source classes are leaf classes of the source schema.

(FIG. 1, wherein field1 is leaf entry of source schema).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine Vedula and Livesay by incorporating the teaching of Vedula into the method of

Livesay. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the graphical

representation of buyer schema mechanism of Vedula into the system of Livesay for the purpose of

providing a graphical tree hieratical structure of target schemas.

As per claim 26, Livesay discloses:

A schema translation tool coupled with a global content

directory server (Paragraph [0100], wherein the XML interface id the translation tool part of (coupled)

to the matching system**), the schema translation tool, comprising:**

a mapping module operable to:

receive information regarding a source schema and a target schema, the source

and target schemas each comprising a taxonomy comprising a hierarchy of classes into which

products may be categorized,

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema (XML data files) (buyer and seller)

wherein the profile content grouping parameter is (taxonomy hierarchy of classes)).

wherein the target schema comprises a different taxonomy then the taxonomy of the source schema,

(Paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema having different profile content (taxonomy data)).

at least the source schema further comprising a product ontology associated with one or more of

the classes, each product ontology comprising one or more product attributes,

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on "best fit" profile

content (product ontology) parameter (attributes))

at least the source schema further comprising one or more pointers identifying one or more seller

databases and associated with one or more classes,

(Paragraphs [0088] and [0129], indicate the database product identification linking the buyer and seller).

the seller databases including product data associated with one or more products categorized in the

classes;

(Paragraphs [0088] and [0129], indicate the database product parameter (classes) identification linking

the buyer and seller).

receive input from at least one of the plurality of buyers indicating one or more source classes of the

source schema to be associated with one or more target classes of the target schema;

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service (product

ontology) parameter (class) using buyer profile (buyer input))

associate one or more source classes with one or more target classes in response

to the input from at least one of the plurality of buyers;

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service)

and associate the pointers of the source classes with one or more target classes associated with the

source class;

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining

association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

and an ontology generation module operable to generate a product ontology for each of the

target classes based on the intersection of the product attributes included in the product

ontologies of the associated source classes.

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link based on "best fit" profile content (product

ontology) is determining association between product parameters between seller and buyer).

Livesay discloses the parsing of data profile and the matching of desired service between buyer and seller,

but does not go into detail regarding generating a graphical representation of profile content (taxonomy),

however in an analogous art of data mapping, Vedula teaches:

generate a graphical representation of the taxonomies of the source and target schemas,

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented)

the graphical representation allowing at least one of a plurality of buyers to graphically

associate the classes of the source schema with classes of the target schema;

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented)

communicate the graphical representation to at least one of the plurality of buyers;

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented wherein the

buyer is the user)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine Vedula and Livesay by incorporating the teaching of Vedula into the method of

Livesay. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the graphical

representation of buyer and seller schema mechanism of Vedula into the system of Livesay for the

purpose of providing a graphical tree hieratical structure of target schemas.

As per claim 27, Livesay discloses:

A method for translating between schemas, comprising:

receiving information regarding a source schema and a target schema, the source and

target schemas each comprising a taxonomy comprising a hierarchy of classes into which

products may be categorized,

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema (XML data files) (buyer and seller)

wherein the profile content grouping parameter is (taxonomy hierarchy of classes)).

at least the source schema further comprising a product ontology associated with one or more of

the classes, each product ontology comprising one or more product attributes,

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on profile content

(product ontology) parameter (class))

at least the source schema further comprising one or more pointers identifying one or more seller

databases and associated with one or more classes,

(Paragraphs [0088] and [0129], indicate the database product identification linking the buyer and seller).

the seller databases including product data associated with one or more products categorized in the

classes;

(Paragraphs [0088] and [0129], indicate the database product parameter (classes) identification linking

the buyer and seller).

receiving input from at least one of the plurality of buyers indicating one or more source

classes of the source schema to be associated with one or more target classes of the target

schema;

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service (product

ontology) parameter (class) using buyer profile (buyer input))

associating one or more source classes with one or more target classes in response to the

input from at least one of the plurality of buyers;

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service)

associating the pointers of the source classes with one or more target classes associated

with the source class;

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining

association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

and generating a product ontology for each of the target classes based on the intersection of

the product attributes included in the product ontologies of the associated source classes.

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link based on "best fit" profile content (product

ontology) is determining association between product parameters between seller and buyer).

Livesay discloses the parsing of data profile and the matching of desired service between buyer and seller,

but does not go into detail regarding generating a graphical representation of profile content (taxonomy),

however in an analogous art of data mapping, Vedula teaches:

generate a graphical representation of the taxonomies of the source and target schemas,

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented)

the graphical representation allowing at least one of a plurality of buyers to graphically

associate the classes of the source schema with classes of the target schema;

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented)

communicate the graphical representation to at least one of the plurality of buyers;

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented wherein the

buyer is the user)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine Vedula and Livesay by incorporating the teaching of Vedula into the method of

Livesay. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the graphical

representation of buyer and seller schema mechanism of Vedula into the system of Livesay for the

purpose of providing a graphical tree hieratical structure of target schemas.

As per claim 28, Livesay discloses:

Software for translating between schemas, the software embodied in a computer-readable medium

and, when executed, operable to:

receive information regarding a source schema and a target schema, the source and target

schemas each comprising a taxonomy comprising a hierarchy of classes into which products may

be categorized,

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema (XML data files) (buyer and seller)

wherein the profile content grouping parameter is (taxonomy hierarchy of classes)).

at least the source schema further comprising a product ontology associated with

one or more of the classes, each product ontology comprising one or more product attributes,

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on profile content

(product ontology) parameter (class))

at least the source schema further comprising one or more pointers identifying one or more seller

databases and associated with one or more classes,

(Paragraphs [0088] and [0129], indicate the database product identification linking the buyer and seller).

the seller databases including product data associated with one or more products categorized in the

classes;

 (Paragraphs [0088] and [0129], indicate the database product parameter (classes) identification linking

the buyer and seller).

receive input from at least one of the plurality of buyers indicating one or more source

classes of the source schema to be associated with one or more target classes of the target

schema;

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service (product

ontology) parameter (class) using buyer profile (buyer input))

associate one or more source classes with one or more target classes in response to the

input from at least one of the plurality of buyers;

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service)

associate the pointers of the source classes with one or more target classes associated

with the source class;

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining

association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

and generate a product ontology for each of the target classes based on the intersection of the

product attributes included in the product ontologies of the associated source classes.

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link based on "best fit" profile content (product

ontology) is determining association between product parameters between seller and buyer).

Livesay discloses the parsing of data profile and the matching of desired service between buyer and seller,

but does not go into detail regarding generating a graphical representation of profile content (taxonomy),

however in an analogous art of data mapping, Vedula teaches:

generate a graphical representation of the taxonomies of the source and target schemas,

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented)

the graphical representation allowing at least one of a plurality of buyers to graphically

associate the classes of the source schema with classes of the target schema;

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented)

communicate the graphical representation to at least one of the plurality of buyers;

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented wherein the

buyer is the user)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine Vedula and Livesay by incorporating the teaching of Vedula into the method of

Livesay. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the graphical

representation of buyer and seller schema mechanism of Vedula into the system of Livesay for the

purpose of providing a graphical tree hieratical structure of target schemas.

Conclusion

As necessitated by amendment, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the

extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the

mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of

this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH

shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action

is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX

MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be

directed to Tarek Chbouki whose telephone number is 571-2703154. The examiner can normally be

reached on Mon-Fri 8:00 am to 6:00 pm EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are

unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chace Christian can be reached on

571-2724190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned

is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained

from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available

through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer

Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR

CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tarek Chbouki/

Examiner, Art Unit 2165

11/10/2008

/Christian P. Chace/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165